

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the Claims as follows. Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Sumanaweera et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0071677) (hereinafter, *Sumanaweera*.) The Examiner also objected to the language and format of the Abstract as presented in the Specification.

Regarding the Examiner's objection to the Abstract, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objection is without merit since both the language format and word count of the Abstract as presented conform to U.S.P.T.O. filing standards. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's objection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), the Examiner states that the indexing and database apparatus disclosed in *Sumanaweera* teaches each and every limitation of Claim 1. After reviewing *Sumanaweera*, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertions.

Sumanaweera essentially teaches an apparatus and method that provides for a way to automatically label, catalog, and describe the content of images and other data using position, orientation; field of view and time of capture. Moreover, *Sumanaweera* further teaches that these images can be first captured using an apparatus possessing a camera or sensor and then downloaded and stored in a uniquely configured computer database.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claim 1 under §102(b), the Examiner first cites paragraphs 0032-0035 of *Sumanaweera* as disclosing a mobile terminal that both transmits a request and is adapted to output "detailed information received in response to a request," as recited by Claim 1. Secondly, the Examiner claims in page 3 of the Office

Action that in paragraphs 0039 thru 0044 of *Sumanaweera* a search system is also recited, where the search system specifically includes “an information database for storing relevant information about multimedia data” and that said search system is then able to transmit “the received detailed information to said mobile terminal,” as presently claimed. However, after reviewing *Sumanaweera* in its entirety, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner was incorrect in rejecting Claim 1.

With reference to paragraphs 0032-0035 of *Sumanaweera*, *Sumanaweera* therein makes no mention of a mobile terminal that outputs (i.e., displays) “detailed information” upon request by the mobile terminal, as presently claimed in the application. In fact, these cited lines of *Sumanaweera* merely establish that “the position of the camera or sensor (14) may also be determined using the cellular phone technology instead of using a Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver.” In essence, it is respectfully submitted that *Sumanaweera* fails to teach or even fairly suggest the limitation of a mobile terminal “for transmitting a request for detailed information about multimedia data and outputting detailed information received in response to the request,” as recited by Claim 1.

Furthermore, in order to further sustain the §102(b) rejection of Claim 1, the Examiner also cites paragraphs 0039-0044 of *Sumanaweera*. In this case, the Examiner specifically states that the “search system” element, as recited by Claim 1, is likewise taught in *Sumanaweera* in paragraphs 0039-0044.


In Claim 1, the recitation of “a search system...transmitting the received information detailed information to said mobile terminal” is disclosed. However, paragraphs 0039-0044 of *Sumanaweera* merely discloses a description of database apparatus (27) transmitting multimedia data to a computer (21) where the multimedia data is subsequently displayed on a computer monitor (22) upon request. Hence, no direct or indirect reference is made to the recitation of “a search system...transmitting the received information detailed information to said mobile terminal,” as recited by Claim 1 of the present application.

Accordingly, as *Sumanaweera* fails to teach or even fairly suggest each and every limitation of Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Regarding in the rejection of independent claim 9 under 35 USC §102(b), Claim 9 includes similar recitations as those contained in Claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully believes that Claim 9 is patentably distinct for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of Claim 1.

Furthermore, Claims 2-8 and 10-16 are dependent upon independent Claims 1 and 9, respectively; accordingly, if the above-mentioned argument places independent Claims 1 and 9 into condition for allowance, then dependent Claims 2-8 and 10-16 will also be in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 2-8 and 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be likewise withdrawn.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-16 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/CEA/fl